



UNITED STATES DAY, ARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/249,660	02/12/99	NAKAJO		Υ	51270-245595
-		- -	EXAMINER		
		WM02/1019	5		
ROGER R WISE PILLSBURY MADISON & SUTRO				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
725 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET SUITE 1200				2651	10
LOS ANGELES	CA 90017-5	443		DATE MAILED:	10/15/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application No. Applicant(s) YAKAJO, YUKIHISA 09/249,660 Office Action Summary **Art Unit** Examiner 2651 Aristotelis M Psitos -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply** A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2001. 1)🔯 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is 3) closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. **Disposition of Claims** 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ___ 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6) Other: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Art Unit: 2651

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's communication of 8/20/01 has been considered with the following results.

1. Claims 1-3 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 5.

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS of 8/20/01 has been reviewed and made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 7 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

As disclosed on page 30-32 with respect to species elected, it is noted that the TE signal is passed while no recording is set. However, this is not what independent claim 7 positively recites.

Dependent claim 8 fails to clarify the above and falls with its parent claim.

AS FAR AS THE CLAIMS RECITE POSITIVE LIMITAIONS and are interpreted by the examiner, the following art rejections are made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2651

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al Applicant's attention is drawn to figure 29 and the disclosure thereto – see col. 42 the 13th embodiment for instance.

As noted therein, the te signal is generated during periods of no recording, and appropriate selection of optimum values obtained. Element 313 has at least a RAM which is interpreted as the storage section of the claim.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohshita et al considered with JP 3-187021.

Ohshita et al discloses a te system having the appropriate storage section – see the operation of elements 10,13, and 14.

Ohshita et al lack any specific mentioning of the te signal during a non recording period.

The acknowledged prior art system of JP 3-187021 teaches the ability of having a te signal output during the non-recording period.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Oshita et al with the teaching from JP 3-18702, motivation is to perform the well known te signal capability during the non-recording period.

9. Claims 7 & 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohshita et al or Watanabe et al either further considered with Eastman et al.

Art Unit: 2651



These claims require the te signal during a recording period.

The ability of providing a te signal during recording is taught by the Eastman et al reference – see column 2 lines 47 to 63. See fig. 9, wrt element 156, we cl. 8.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of either Ohsita et al or Watanabe et al with the teaching from Eastman et al, motivation is to provide for on track control during changing conditions during data recording as acknowledged by Eastman et al.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6 –8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The indication of allowance in the previous Office action is no longer maintained due to the discovery of the newly cited references and the new 112 rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aristotelis M Psitos whose telephone number is (703) 308-1598. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thursday 8 - 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

David Hudspeth can be reached on (703) 308-4825. The fax phone numbers for the organization where
this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 8729314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700___/

Aristotelis M Psitos Primary Examiner Art Unit 2651

AMP October 9, 2001